

## REMARKS

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,078,379 to Nagae et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Nagae et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of the present invention. More specifically, the Nagae et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest a liquid crystal display substrate that includes, *inter alia*, a cell gap control layer, formed inside the sealing material forming region, that reduces a cell gap between the base substrate and an opposite substrate provided opposite to the base substrate, “such that the cell gap in a display area where said cell gap control layer is formed is less than a gap in an area outside of said cell gap control layer,” as now defined in amended independent Claims 1 and 3.

One example of an embodiment of the present invention that includes the cell gap control layer defined in independent Claims 1 and 3 is shown in Applicants’ Figures 3 and 4. In these figures, the cell gap control layer 42 is shown as being inside the sealing material forming region (near sealing material 40). Further, Figure 4 also shows how the cell gap control layer 42 reduces the cell gap between the base substrate 10 and the opposite substrate 11 to thickness “d1,” such that the cell gap in a display area (of thickness d1) where the cell gap control layer 42 is formed is less than a gap in an area outside of the cell gap control layer 42 (of thickness d2). Such a configuration advantageously provides a desirably smaller cell gap (d1) in the display area, without the need for reducing the amount of sealing

material ejected from the dispenser because a gap (d2) in the sealing material forming region can remain relatively large.

In contrast, the device of the Nagae et al. reference lacks the claimed cell gap control layer whereby the cell gap in the display area where the cell gap is formed is less than the gap in an area outside of the cell gap control layer, as defined in amended Claims 1 and 3.

In the June 29, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner equated element 23 of Figure 17 of Nagae et al. with the claimed cell gap control layer. However, as can be seen in Figure 18 of Nagae et al., which is a cross-section of Figure 17, element 23 does not reduce the cell gap so that it is less in a display area than in an area outside of the cell gap control layer, as defined in independent Claims 1 and 3. Instead, in the Nagae et al. device, the cell gap in the display area where the cell gap control layer is formed is the same as the cell gap in the remainder of the device. Accordingly, as all of the features of independent Claims 1 and 3 are not disclosed in the Nagae et al. reference, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §102(b) rejection of independent Claims 1 and 3, and associated dependent Claims 2, 4 and 5, under the Nagae et al. reference.

Claims 1, 3, 6, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,859,683 to Tagusa et al. in view of United States Patent No. 5,982,471 to Hirakata et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the present invention. More specifically, neither the Tagusa et al. reference, nor the Hirakata et al. reference, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest

the liquid crystal display substrate that includes, *inter alia*, a cell gap control layer, formed inside the sealing material forming region, that reduces a cell gap between the base substrate and an opposite substrate provided opposite to the base substrate, “such that the cell gap in a display area where said cell gap control layer is formed is less than a gap in an area outside of said cell gap control layer,” as now defined in amended independent Claims 1 and 3.


As mentioned above, Applicants’ Figure 4 shows how the cell gap control layer 42 reduces the cell gap between the base substrate 10 and the opposite substrate 11 to thickness “d1,” such that the cell gap in a display area (of thickness d1) where the cell gap control layer 42 is formed is less than a gap in an area outside of the cell gap control layer 42 (of thickness d2). In contrast, layer 38 of the Tagusa et al. reference does show such a claimed relationship for the cell gap. In fact, the Tagusa et al. reference fails to mention anything about the cell gap thickness outside of the display area. Further, the Hirakata et al. reference does not disclose or suggest this feature, nor was it relied upon for this feature by the Examiner. Accordingly, as all of the features of independent Claims 1 and 3 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §103 rejection of independent Claims 1 and 3 and associated dependent Claims 6 and 7.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference

would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By   
James K. Folker  
Registration No. 37,538

September 27, 2005

Suite 2500  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080

Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\1324\68802\9C5998.DOC